

REMARKS

The claims in the application are 1 and 28-49.

Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

As indicated in the Petition to Suspend Action of Office and the Preliminary Amendment submitted with the RCE filed on May 12, 2006, the Applicants have used the period of suspension of action of the Office to conduct several "side-by-side" comparison experiments. The experiments conducted compare the synthetic paper of the present invention with one of Takashi et al. as suggested by the Board in the Decision on Appeal. The results are set forth in a fourth Supplemental Declaration describing the experiments of the "side-by-side" comparison and the results obtained from these experiments. A copy of the Declaration is submitted herewith.

As indicated in the Declaration, Experiment 1 was conducted in the same manner as Example 12 of U.S. Patent No. 4,318, 950 (Takashi et al.). Experiment 2 set forth in the accompanying Declaration was prepared in the same manner as in Experiment 1 of the accompanying Declaration, except PHOSPHANOL RL-20, a high-molecular weight antistatic agent was used instead of the low-molecular weight antistatic agent. The results are presented in tables 1 and 2 of the Declaration.

Experiment 3 of the Declaration was prepared in the same manner as Experiment 1 of the accompanying Declaration, except instead of the low molecular weight antistatic agent at 0.7 parts by weight, 20 parts by weight was used. In addition, after laminating the paper-like layer to the base layer, the low molecular weight

antistatic agent was bled out of the paper-like layer and the surface tackiness was generated on the forming roll. The results are set forth in tables 1 and 2 of the Declaration.

Finally, Experiment 4 of the Declaration was prepared as in Example 1 of the present invention and the results are set forth in tables 1 and 2 of the Declaration submitted.

As can be seen from tables 1 and 2 in the accompanying Declaration, the surface resistivity of the synthetic paper containing 0.7 parts by weight of low molecular weight antistatic agent in Experiment 1 was $2 \times 10^{13} \Omega$ before washing with water and $1 \times 10^{16} \Omega$ after washing with water, indicating that the antistatic agent was washed out. Similarly, the low molecular weight antistatic agent on the surface of the synthetic paper of Experiment 3 was washed out with water resulting in a surface resistivity that remained unchanged. However, the high molecular antistatic agent of Experiment 2 was not washed out with water.

Finally, the surface resistivity in Experiment 4 also remained roughly the same before and after washing with water indicating that the amount of antistatic agent was not washed away.

In addition to surface resistivity of the synthetic paper, the Offset Printability of the paper was also evaluated. Evaluation of the Offset Printability (Ink Adhesion) of Experiments 1-4 of the Declaration indicates that unlike the synthetic paper produced according to Experiments 1-3, the ink adhesion on the synthetic paper of Experiment 4 would **not** become practically problematic **and** there would **not** be a high frequency of paper feeding/discharge because of a high surface resistivity.

Therefore, based on the "side-by-side" comparison experiments performed and reported in the Declaration submitted herewith, the synthetic paper of Experiments 1-3 are practically unacceptable, where the synthetic paper of Experiment 4, which was produced according to Example 1 of the present application, is far superior and therefore, is practically acceptable for the market.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments and remarks made in the Preliminary Amendment mailed May 12, 2006, as well as the results of the "side-by-side" experiments reported in the Fourth Supplemental Declaration submitted herewith, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presented herein are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, then it is respectfully requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the earliest convenience to discuss the present application.

Early, favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leo G. Lenna", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Leo G. Lenna
Reg. No. 42,796
Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, NY 11553
(516) 228-8484

LGL/nep